

A glass transition scenario based on heterogeneities and entropy barriers

Andrea Crisanti¹ and Felix Ritort²

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma “La Sapienza”, P.le Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy
Istituto Nazionale Fisica della Materia, Unità di Roma*

²*Departament de Física Fonamental, Facultat de Física, Universitat de Barcelona
Diagonal 647, 08028 Barcelona (Spain)
E-Mail: crisanti@phys.uniroma1.it, ritort@ffn.ub.es*

We propose a scenario for the glass transition based on the cooperative nature of nucleation processes and entropic effects. The main point is the relation between the off-equilibrium energy dissipation and nucleation processes in off-equilibrium supercooled liquids which leads to a natural definition of the complexity. From the absence of coarsening growth we can derive an entropy based fluctuation formula which relates the free energy dissipation rate in the glass with the nucleation rate of the largest cooperative regions. As by-product we obtain a new phenomenological relation between the largest relaxation time in the supercooled liquid phase and an effective temperature. This differs from the Adam-Gibbs relation in that predicts no divergence of the primary relaxation time at the Kauzmann temperature and the existence of a crossover from fragile to strong behavior.

I. INTRODUCTION

Standard approaches to the glass transition have been largely based on hydrodynamic or thermodynamic entropic theories like that proposed by Adam, Gibbs and Di Marzio (hereafter referred to as AGM) nearly 50 years ago [1]. Surprisingly, still nowadays the ideal AGM theory remains not accepted nor disproved, and an unifying description of the glass transition problem is still not available. A striking outcome of the AGM theory is the prediction of a second-order phase transition driven by the collapse of the configurational entropy (also called complexity) at the Kautzman temperature T_K .

Strictly speaking an unambiguous definition of the complexity is only possible in mean-field theories where phase space splits into ergodic components of infinite lifetime. Recent approaches to the glass transition problem from the perspective of disordered systems have, to a large extent, validated this mean-field scenario [2]. Nevertheless, a complete understanding of the glass transition must go beyond mean field by including nucleation processes into any valuable theory. This poses the question about how the mean-field picture for the glass transition is modified in the presence of real-space effects.

Here we propose a scenario for the glass transition where spatial effects due to heterogeneities play the central role.

II. PHENOMENOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION OF HETEROGENEITIES IN GLASSES

One of the most intriguing features in glasses is the existence of heterogeneous structures [3]. Experimentally these manifest as some set of atoms which have a dynamics manifestly slow when compared to the rest. Although experiments or numerical simulations in this field are very recent, heterogeneities are a direct manifestation of the cooperative nature of nucleation processes [4]. The heterogeneities observed in the experiments are transient frozen structures which nucleate on time scales of the order or larger than the observational time. When a droplet of liquid nucleates it changes to a new locally disordered structure. The local structure of the glass is always that of a liquid and no coarsening of a given pattern is observed.

Our starting point is the assumption that nucleation processes take place everywhere inside the glass when some correlated structures of typical size s are built by an anchorage or cooperative mechanism. By anchorage mechanism we mean that s atoms must coherently move to occupy positions which enable that region to release some stress energy. Each of these moves constitutes an elementary activated process, for instance, the exchange between two neighboring particles. In our scenario the time to anchor a region of size s is,

$$\frac{\tau(s)}{\tau_0} \propto \left(\frac{\tau^*}{\tau_0} \right)^s = \exp \left(\frac{Bs}{T} \right) \quad (1)$$

where $\tau^* = \tau_0 \exp(B/T)$ is the activated time to anchor one atom, τ_0 being a microscopic time and B the corresponding energy barrier.

Experimentally it is known that time correlations in the glass state are stretched but still decay faster than any power law. Because of (1) this means that the distribution $n_s(t)$, the number of cooperative regions (domains) of size

s which have already nucleated at time t , must fall down abruptly beyond a maximum size $s^*(t)$ for extremely long relaxations to occur with a negligible probability. Consequently, $n_s(t)$ must have a well defined cutoff at s^* such that $n_s(t)$ for $s > s^*$ is nearly zero [6]. It can be shown that the existence of this cutoff is tightly related to the cooperative character of the dynamics itself eq.(1) and can be illustrated within a simple domain aggregation model [7].

Consequently, relaxation to equilibrium of, say, a supercooled liquid is driven by the growth of the largest domain size or cutoff value $s^*(t)$ since the release of energy to the thermal bath occurs only when the largest domains of size s^* nucleate for the first time. Nucleation processes of regions of size smaller than $s^*(t)$ always occur but do not yield a net thermal current flow to the thermal bath. Metastable equilibrium is reached when the cutoff size s^* saturates and the net energy flow between the glass and the bath vanishes.

Without knowing any further details about the hydrodynamic equations which describe the relaxation we can set up a phenomenological equation for the energy dissipation inside the glass. This may be described by any thermodynamic potential variable, for instance the free energy F . The release of energy per unit time inside the glass is given by typical free energy variation of those domains which relax (i.e those with size $s^*(t)$) multiplied by its multiplicity $N_{s^*}(t) = V n_{s^*}(t) = (V/s^*) \hat{n}(1)$ [7], divided by their typical nucleation time $t^* = \exp(B\beta s^*)$,

$$\frac{1}{V} \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \sim \frac{\Delta F^* N_{s^*}(t)}{V t^*} \sim \frac{\Delta F^*}{s^* t^*} \quad . \quad (2)$$

The crucial point which distinguishes nucleations processes in glasses from other physical systems is the fact that nucleation occurs between liquid drops. This means that contrarily to standard nucleation theory, the typical release of energy ΔF^* by nucleating a liquid droplet of size s^* does not scale with its surface (like in coarsening systems) nor its volume (like in standard liquid-solid nucleations) but is finite and independent of s^* [1] yielding,

$$\frac{1}{V} \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \sim - \frac{\Delta_F}{s^* t^*} \quad . \quad (3)$$

where Δ_F is the average free energy fluctuation. The size s^* grows with time as $s^*(t) \sim T \log(t)$ and stops when $n_s(t = t_{\text{eq}})$ reaches the stationary distribution. In principle the value of the equilibration time t_{eq} depends on the particular model under consideration. From a microscopic theory this information is only contained in the hydrodynamic equations. We will see below how we can circumvent the hydrodynamic description by relating the relaxation time of the supercooled liquid to the complexity density.

III. THE FLUCTUATION FORMULA.

One of the main problems of the standard AGM theory is how to define the complexity S_c . In the original AGM theory, S_c was defined as the number of conformational states of the liquid compatible with a given energy. The problem in this definition is the following: if the complexity is a static quantity then one is naturally led to the conclusion that it vanishes in the supercooled liquid line if measured over time scales much larger than the largest decorrelation time. In turn, according to the Adam-Gibbs relation, this implies a divergence of the relaxation time. This contradiction can be avoided defining a dynamical complexity $S_c(t^*, F)$ by counting all conformations (or basins) of the liquid with free energy F which nucleate in a time of the order of the primary relaxation time. Recently, this definition has been applied to some mean-field spin glass models where nucleation processes are neglected [8,9]. Let us assume that the liquid is in off-equilibrium after a quench to temperature T_f . Here we define $S_c(t^*, F)$ as the logarithm of the total number of conformations with free energy F which can release energy after nucleating for their first time at time t^* . In other words, $S_c(t^*, F)$ counts the number of still *not visited* conformations at time t^* . In this scenario regions which have nucleated once have already released their energy while regions which have not nucleated still contain some strain energy. Nucleations which do not lead to a release of strain energy do not yield new conformational states.

Each of these conformations at time t^* may contain different possible configurations $\mathcal{C}$ which do not contribute to the complexity but contribute to the free energy of the conformation $\mathcal{B}$, $F_{\mathcal{B}}(t^*, T_f) = -T_f \log(\sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{B}} \exp(-E(\mathcal{C})/T_f))$ allowing also to define time dependent expectation values of any observable $A_{\mathcal{B}}(t^*, T_f)$ as follows: $A_{\mathcal{B}}(t^*, T_f) = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{B}} A(\mathcal{C}) \exp\left(-\frac{(E(\mathcal{C}) - F_{\mathcal{B}}(t^*, T_f))}{T_f}\right)$.

The liquid character of the glass phase implies that basins with identical free energy $F_{\mathcal{B}}(t^*, T_f)$ have the same physical properties. Note that the free energy and the expectation value of any observable A evaluated at a given conformation $\mathcal{B}$ depend on both T_f and the quenching time t^* through the configurations $\mathcal{C}$ contained in $\mathcal{B}$. In particular, note that for large times basins with very high free energy only contain configurations which have nucleated several times, hence they do not contribute to the complexity. Contrarily, conformations with very low free energy contain

configurations which have still not nucleated so they contribute to the complexity. This leads to a dynamical complexity having a time-dependent cutoff value F^* such that the number of conformations or basins with $F_{\mathcal{B}}(t^*, T_f) > F^*$ vanishes. The complexity is a monotonous increasing function of the free energy since the number of possible conformations which decrease the energy is larger when nucleating regions are smaller. In the asymptotic large t^* limit it takes the form,

$$S_c(t^*, F < F^*) = \hat{S}_c(F, T_f) ; S_c(t^*, F > F^*) \rightarrow -\infty \quad (4)$$

Since at time t^* after the quenching nucleations inside the glass occur between cooperative regions with a local liquid structure and no coarsening process drives the nucleation, nucleations must be entropically driven. In other words, the probability to jump from any conformation with free energy F onto a conformation with free energy F' is always proportional to the number of configurations with final free energy F' ,

$$\mathcal{W}_{F \rightarrow F'} \propto \frac{\Omega(F')}{\Omega(F)} \propto \exp(\hat{S}_c(F', T_f) - \hat{S}_c(F, T_f)) \quad . \quad (5)$$

Substituting (4) in (5) and denoting $\delta F = F' - F$ we obtain for the transition probability,

$$\mathcal{W}_{\delta F} \propto \exp\left[\beta_{\text{eff}}(F^*)\delta F\right]\theta(-\delta F) \quad (6)$$

where we have defined the effective temperature $\beta_{\text{eff}}(F^*) = \left(\frac{\partial \hat{S}_c(F, T_f)}{\partial F}\right)_{F=F^*}$ as the density of complexity with free energy F^* . This is the fluctuation formula which establishes the probability of free energy fluctuations. Fluctuations to conformations or basins which increase the free energy are forbidden, simply because they have already nucleated in the past. While fluctuations to very low free energy conformations are entropically suppressed due to the monotonous increasing property of $\hat{S}_c(F, T_f)$.

Using the above expression for the free energy fluctuations it follows that in the off-equilibrium state the average rate variation of the free energy at time t^* is then given by,

$$\frac{1}{V} \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \sim - \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x \mathcal{W}_x dx}{t^* \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{W}_x dx} = - \frac{1}{\beta_{\text{eff}}(F^*) t^*}. \quad (7)$$

Consistency between this equation with the hydrodynamic equation (3) requires that $s^* = \Delta_F \beta_{\text{eff}}(F^*)$, i.e. the size of the largest nucleating regions s^* is directly proportional to the complexity density (also called effective temperature) $\beta_{\text{eff}}(F^*)$ evaluated at the time-dependent free energy F^* .

From the scenario drawn above off-equilibrium relaxation goes as follows: as time goes on, F^* decreases up to time t_{eq} when it converges to the equilibrium value $F_{\text{eq}} = F(t_{\text{eq}}, T_f)$. At this time, s^* has saturated to a value $s^*(t_{\text{eq}})$ which determines the phenomenological relation,

$$\tau_{\alpha} = \tau_0 \exp(B s^*(t_{\text{eq}})/T_f) = \tau_0 \exp(B \Delta_F \beta_{\text{eff}}(F_{\text{eq}})/T_f). \quad (8)$$

In the AGM scenario [1] the number of different conformations at time t^* corresponds to all possible combinations Ω_{t^*} obtained from the two possibilities (nucleated or not nucleated) for the different independent largest nucleating regions $n_{s^*}(t^*)$. The number of conformations is given by $\Omega_{t^*} = 2^{\frac{V}{s^*}}$ yielding for the complexity, $S_c(t^*) = \log(\Omega_{t^*}) = V(\log(2)/s^*)$ directly relating the size of the cooperative region to the complexity. Using eq.(1) and taking $t^* = t_{\text{eq}}$ this yields the famous Adams-Gibbs relation $\tau_{\alpha} = \exp(B \log(2)/T_f s_c)$. By analyzing in details the AGM scenario we see that it contains the strong assumption that in the off-equilibrium regime the glass explores conformations differing by the nucleation of the largest regions as if they were in equilibrium at the quenching temperature T_f , assumption which obviously cannot hold if the system is in off-equilibrium and free energy fluctuations are biased towards lower free energy conformations. Note that according to AGM, the size of the cooperative region diverges at the Kauzmann temperature T_K while in the scenario presented here it saturates to a finite value.

IV. FLUCTUATION-DISSIPATION RELATION

One more consequence of the fluctuation formula (6) concerns the fluctuation-dissipation ratio (FDR) and its one-step character [10,11]. After quenching to T_f a possible way to quantify violation of FDR is to measure the average value of any observable A after a perturbation field h_A conjugated to the observable A is applied to the system. Due to the liquid order of the cooperative regions, if the perturbation does not bias one class of conformation over others,

the entropically driven assumption implies that states with free energy F are sampled with a probability according to their number. In the presence of a field h_A the complexity must be a function of three variables, $\hat{S}_c(F, T_f, A)$. We can simply obtain the average change in the expectation value $\langle A(t) \rangle$ after switching on the perturbation field h_A at time t_w . In the linear response regime [12] the Onsager regression principle implies for the transition probabilities

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_{\delta F, \delta A=A-A_0} &= \mathcal{W}_{\delta F} \exp[(\hat{S}_c(F, T_f, A) - \hat{S}_c(F, T_f, A_0))] \\ &= \mathcal{W}_{\delta F} \exp\left(\frac{\partial \hat{S}_c(F, A)}{\partial A}\right)_{A_0}.\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

Using the relation $(\frac{\partial \hat{S}_c(F, A)}{\partial A})_{A_0} = -\beta_{\text{eff}}(F)h_A$ and expanding for h_A small we finally get the famous violation FDT expression,

$$\frac{\partial \langle A \rangle(t)}{\partial h_A(t_w)} = \beta_{\text{eff}}(F^*)(\langle A(t)(A(t) - A(t_w)) \rangle)_{h_A=0}.\quad (10)$$

The description of the violation of FDT in terms of a single time scale t^* is therefore consequence of the asymmetric shape (i.e. $\mathcal{W}_{\delta F > 0} = 0$) of (6).

V. MAIN IMPLICATIONS OF THE PRESENT SCENARIO.

It can be proven [13] that $\beta_{\text{eff}}(F) \leq 1/T_K$ where $\hat{S}_c(T_K) = 0$ at the Kauzmann temperature T_K . This implies an asymptotic crossover for all fragile liquids to strong behavior. A strong glass is a fragile one which has exhausted all its complexity and the effective barrier has saturated to its maximum value $\beta_{\text{eff}} = 1/T_K$. Instead fragile glasses have high excess complexity and still big variation of the complexity density β_{eff} along the supercooled line. The dependence of the activation barrier in (8) through the non-universal quantity β_{eff} explains why it is so difficult to find a unique empirical law that properly describes the viscosity anomaly of all glasses. The prediction that s^* saturates to a finite value $s^* = \Delta_F/T_K$ at T_K is not easy to check experimentally due to the difficulty to cover one order of magnitude in the effective barrier. Despite that experimental results suggest a crossover from fragile to strong crossover scenario [14,15] the present scenario can be also checked doing numerical aging experiments. According to relation (8) the t_w dependent effective temperature $\beta_{\text{eff}}(t_w)$ (measured through FDT-violations or the formula 6) should be given by $\beta_{\text{eff}}(t_w) \rightarrow (T_f/B\Delta_F)\log(t_w/\tau_0)$ if $\tau_\alpha(t_w) \simeq t_w$ and both τ_0 and $B\Delta_F$ are nearly t_w and T_f independent. This relation should hold for all T_f and t_w predicting a value for the activation barrier and the cooperative size [16]. The experimental confirmation of a saturation of the heterogeneity sizes for not too fragile glasses and the crossover from fragile to strong behavior is probably not out of reach and would be a check of the validity of the present theory.

Acknowledgments. We wish to thank suggestions by C. Cabrillo, G. Parisi, F. Sciortino and G. Tarjus. F.R. is supported by the MEC in Spain, project PB97-0971.

-
- [1] J. H. Gibbs and E. A. Di Marzio, J. Chem. Phys. **28**, 373 (1968); G. Adams and J. H. Gibbs, J. Chem. Phys. **43**, 139 (1965).
 - [2] T. R. Kirkpatrick, and D. Thirumalai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 2091 (1987); T.R. Kirkpatrick and P.G. Wolynes, Phys. Rev. **B36**, 8552 (1987).
 - [3] R. Schiener et al., Science **274**, 752 (1996); W. Kob et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2827 (1997); R. Böhmer et al., J. Non Cryst. Solids **235**, 1 (1998).
 - [4] E. Vidal Russell and N. E. Israeloff, Nature **408**, 695 (2000)
 - [5] This scenario is then different from other real-space theories of the glass transition based on the growth of locally frustrated ordered domains, D. Kivelson et al., Physica **A219**, 27 (1995); G. Tarjus and D. Kivelson, J. Chem. Phys. **103**, 3071 (1995).
 - [6] The existence of this cutoff is assumed in other approaches, X. Xia and P. G. Wolynes, **cond-mat**/0008432.
 - [7] A. Crisanti and F. Ritort, **cond-mat**/0102104.
 - [8] Th. M. Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1317 (1997); J. Phys. A (Math. Gen.) **31**, L201 (1998).
 - [9] G. Biroli and J. Kurchan, **cond-mat**/0005499.
 - [10] L. F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan, Phys. Rev. Lett, J. Phys. A (Math. Gen.) **71**, 173 (1993); S. Franz and M. Mezard, Europhys. Lett. **26**, 209 (1994).
 - [11] G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3660 (1997); J. L. Barrat and W. Kob, Europhys. Lett. **46**, 637 (1999); F. Sciortino and P. Tartaglia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 107 (2001);
 - [12] An racionalization of the mean-field case has been presented by S. Franz and M. Virasoro, J. Phys. A (Math. Gen.) **33**, 891 (2000).
 - [13] M. Mezard, Physica A, **265**, 352 (1999).

- [14] A. Cavagna, Preprint **cond-mat**/9910244
- [15] C. A. Angell, J. Non Cryst. Solids **102**, 205 (1988); E. Rossler, K. U. Hess, V. N. Novikov, J. Non Cryst. Solids **223**, 207 (1998); J. F. W. Starr, C. A. Angell, R. J. Speedy and H. E. Stanley, Preprint **cond-mat** **9903451**.
- [16] Preliminary results for a simple spin model studied by A. Crisanti and F. Ritort, Europhys. Lett. **51**, 147 (2000); **52**, 640 (2000) support this prediction showing that typical cooperative regions roughly include 10 spins for the longest simulated times.